DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 211 286 EC C13 091

AUTHOR Ziller, Robert C.; And Others
TITLE Understanding Children of Poverty and Affluence Through Auto-Photographic Metaphor.
PUB DATE Aug 81
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (Los Angeles, CA, August 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affluent Youth; Children; *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Mexicans; *Photographs; Poverty; *Research Methodology; *Self Concept; Sex Differences; Socioeconomic Influences; Socioeconomic Status
IDENTIFIERS *Autophotographic Metaphor; Mexico (Mexico City)

ABSTRACT

The self-social-environmenatl orientations of twenty-nine 12-year old children of poverty and children of affluence in Mexico City were obtained through 12 photographs taken by these children in response to the question "Who Are You?" The five findings which differentiated the children of affluence from the children of poverty pertained to the self, activities, books, games, and range of orientations. Some of the most extreme differences were observed between affluent boys and poverty girls. The girls of poverty showed no photographs of self, activities, games, or toys, whereas every affluent boy showed at least one photograph which included the self, with the most photographs involving music and art activities, lessons, possessions, games and toys, and the least photographs showing others, groups, and religion. Girls of poverty showed the least possessions and lowest range of orientations but most of crowds (more than three people), holding a child, other people, and groups. Boys best represented the effects of affluence and girls best represented effects of poverty. The depicted psychological niches of the affluent represented a circumscribed, high-potential, self-reinforcing system. The psychological niches of the children of poverty (particularly girls) represented a limited system of support within an extended group. (Author/CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED211286

NOV 1981
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

Understanding Children of Poverty and Affluence Through Auto-Photographic Metaphor[1]

Robert C. Ziller, Hernan Vera,
University of Florida
and
Christina Camacho de Santoya
Universidad Iberoamerica
Mexico

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA, August 1981.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R.C. Ziller
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC 013091

Abstract

The self-social-enviromental orientations of children of poverty and children of affluence in Mexico City were obtained through twelve photographs taken by these children in response to the question "Who are you?" Content analysis of the photographs shows that children of affluence include a higher percent of photographs of the self, activities, games and toys and a more extended range of orientations. Girls of poverty showed no photographs in these categories but showed more people. The depicted psychological niches of the affluent represent a circumscribed, high potential self-reinforcing system. The psychological niches of the children of poverty (Particularly girls) represents a limited system of support within an extended group.

One of the main objectives of social science is to increase understanding of ourselves and significant others within an environmental setting. The process of understanding through auto-photographic metaphor involves a set of orientations. Orientations are points of personal reference in the environment which render the situation meaningful and under the control of the individual. The individual scans the environment and structures it in terms of a set of objects of orientation (see Parsons & Shils, 1951, p. 4-5). These objects are either social (individual actors or collectives) or non-social (physical objects or accumulated cultural resources). The orientation process entails selection of various objects through cognitive discrimination and the set of orientations represented as images provides a psychological niche for the actor.

The psychological niche which includes self-defining objects, persons and symbols serves as a source of self-reinforcement and reaffirmation of the self. The process is somewhat like looking into a mirror to reestablish contact with the somatic-self. Selected objects, persons, and symbols in the environment serve to reaffirm the self and provide an environment which is meaningful or not alien. It is assumed that persons do not simply accept the environment as given, but create or influence the environment cognitively. Orientations reflect a degree of personal control as opposed to environmental control. Thus the psychological niche is a set of images of the individual's orientations which serve as a control mechanism through the process of self-reaffirmation. Furthermore, it is proposed that understanding of the individual will be improved through depiction of the psychological niche.

The Photographic Metaphor

Understanding begins with an effort to clarify the meaning. In this interpretative process the stimulus is often transformed using another domain of construction, an alternative frame of reference or language system to bear upon a set of observations. Indeed this is fundamental to the scientific approach, for example, the use of the model of an atom (Levy, 1963 p. 7). This juxtaposition of the elements into another framework, often a personal framework, stimulates cognitive processes such as information search, comparison and contrast, and creativity. In the process personal meaning evolves. The cognitive processes lead to a unique interpretation by the individual within a personally constructed system. Often these interpretations are accompanied by images which are significant for the individual and help to integrate and assimilate the new concepts. This search for understanding through transformation to another domain describes the function of metaphor.

The study of metaphor dates back to Aristotle and has recently attracted the attention of psychologists (Billou, 1977; Ortony & Reynolds, 1978). Essentially metaphor depicts one thing in terms of another. It is essentially useful for the communication of things that can not (or could not) be literally expressed or where the meaning must be constructed rather than "read off" (Ortony, 1979, p. 2). It assumes that language is a creative activity rather than a computerized process. In this way metaphors can provide a different way of seeing the world and the articulation of new ideas.

Thus, Petrie (1979) proposes that the principle function of metaphor is to permit the understanding of new concepts by an iterative process from the more familiar metaphorical vehicle. It is a bridge between the

known and the unknown through the use of ostensive reference. Perhaps this explains in part why metaphor is the medium for understanding by children.

Yet, the metaphor as studied to date emphasizes verbal communication which may not be the preferred representational system for a given group of persons. Indeed, very often the metaphoric elements are mediated by images. The lesser known element of the metaphor evokes an image which is then described verbally. In a sense, a most significant step in metaphoric communication is ignored because of the difficulty of studying images and the relative ease of analyzing the verbal response. The ease of analysis, however, may mask the questions of the validity of verbal responses. Do the subjectic word labels mean what the investigator think they mean? Kelly (1955, p. 268) suggests that if a test "can be arranged to produce a kind of protocol which can be subjected to a meaningful analysis, independent of words, we shall have made great progress toward a better understanding" of the person. "We know more than we can tell" (Polanyi, 1966, p. 4) at least verbally. It is proposed here that photographic metaphor possesses many of these qualifications. Here the target system which is to be understood is new and abstract (Who are you?) and the base system in terms of which the target is described is familiar and perhaps visualizable (see Gentner, 1980). The base system analogous to the target (Who are you?) is a series of photographs.

The resulting connections between the target, "Who are you?", (see Kuhn 1960) and the base, a set of photographs, may be called an "expressive metaphor as opposed to an explanatory metaphor. In the former value is placed on richness as opposed to clarify and consistency. The approach to photographic metaphor follows. The present study was designed to

improve understanding of children from an environment of poverty and children from an environment of affluence using photographic metaphor. The self and a photograph are respectively the base and target of the metaphor.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 29 twelve year old children from two socio-economically contrasting areas in Mexico City. In the one district, the children selected as subjects lived with their families in a single room in a building with several other families within a similar space. There was no running water within the building. The children were of Indian descent and rarely attended school. There were 9 boys and 6 girls in this group of subjects.

The contrasting group of children lived in single-family dwellings in an exclusive area with limited access. They were of Spanish descent and all attended school regularly. There were 8 boys and 6 girls in this group of subjects.

The children of poverty included in the study were contacted through an American woman with a religious background who "looked after" about 120 children from this environment of poverty. The children selected were the first 9 boys and 6 girls that could be contacted through the intermediary.

The children in the affluent group were from families living in an exclusive residential area near the residence of one of the members of the research team.

Procedure

The children were told that this task was being given to children

from several countries in the world to help us to understand children better (This was in fact the case). After the instructions were verbally presented by the second and third authors (to whom Spanish was their native language), the children were shown how to operate a Polaroid camera which required no adjustments. A flash attachment was not used. Then the children were asked to make a list of the things they would like to photograph for the task. In most cases it was necessary for the authors to write the descriptions. The task was approached extremely seriously by all of the children and none had any difficulty with the operation of the camera. After each photograph was taken it was handed to the author in the field who accompanied the children. A set of photographs from a child from each group are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Auto-Photography

In the photographic approach to orientations (Ziller & Smith, 1977; Combs & Ziller, 1977), the subject is provided with an Instamatic camera and twelve-exposure film and the following instructions:

> We want you to describe to yourself how you see yourself. To do this we would like you to take (or have someone else take) 12 photographs that tell who you are. These photographs can be of anything just as long as they tell something about who you are. You should not be interested in your skill as a photographer. Keep in mind that the photographs should describe who you are as you see yourself. When you finish you will have a book about yourself that is made up of only 12 photographs. Remember, these photographs are to simply tell something about you as you see yourself.

Among the first to use the "Who are you?" approach were Begental and Zelen (1950). They merely provided the respondent with a blank piece

of paper and asked him/her to give three answers to the question, "Who are you?" These answers were then classified by mention of name, status characteristics, affective quality, and the like.

Several advantages inhere in the approach. Respondents are able to represent themselves in any frameworks they please; the approach is simple, and there is a quality of rich revealingness about the self-representation. Some of the same qualities are preserved by substituting photographs (by a nonsophisticated photographer) for words in response to "Who are you?" and at the same time some of the shortcomings of verbal responses are avoided. In addition, the photographic, nonverbal approach requires gross information reduction, is phenomenological, and may be the preferred representational system for subjects with communication handicaps.

The photographic self-concept only provides the starting point, however, for the more basic concern, orientation. By focusing on the self-concept, an affective and motivational component is introduced which personalizes the task, leading to more meaningful content. The study of orientations becomes the study of perceptions outside the laboratory, involving content meaningful to the subject and selected by the subject from a wide range of alternatives. An action component is introduced by requiring the subject to find the appropriate environment, to focus on the section of it which serves as the basis of the nonverbal message, and to make a decision by opening the camera shutter.

Content Analysis

The content analysis of the sets of photographs follows and extends the procedures used in earlier research with the "Who are you?" approach (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954) and the classic approaches to dream analysis (Hall & Van DeCastle, 1966). Consistent with theory of orientations, the

content analysis involves the environmental, social, and self constructs. One example of an environmental construct is aesthetic orientation, the percentage of photographs focusing upon the sky, water, flowers, works of art, and the like. An example of a social construct is hedonic tone, the percentage of the total number of photographs involving people where at least one person is seen to be smiling. The 19 resulting categories include:

(a) self - percentage of photographs with self included,

(b) other people - percentage of photographs including people other than the self,

(c) groups - percentage of photographs showing 2 or more people,

(d) groups larger than 3 - percentage of photographs showing 3 or more people,

(e) father - percentage of photographs showing the subject's father,

(f) mother - percengage of photographs showing the subject's mother,

(g) self holding a child,

(h) home - percentage of photographs showing the subject's home,

(i) school - percentage of photographs showing a school,

(k) aesthetic orientation - percentage of photographs focusing upon one or more of the following: potted plants, trees, shrubs and flowers, scenes, and art objects,

(l) hedonic tone - percentage of photographs showing people where at least one person is smiling,

(m) activities - percentage of photographs showing at least one person doing something (such as being involved in a sport) or showing a symbol of an activity (such as a piece of sports equipment),

(n) music or art activities - a special subunit of the activities category,

(o) possessions - percentage of photographs focusing upon an object belonging to the subject, such as a watch or record, or an object of future possession such as an automobile,

(p) religion - percentage of photographs which include at least one symbol, such as a church, cross, statue of a religious person, or book about religion,

(q) games - percentage of photographs depicting a game such as chess and the like,

(r) toys - percentage of photographs showing objects such as dolls.

(z) range of orientations - the total number of the above categories (a to r) which are used in coding a set of photographs.

Inter-rater reliability for these categories ranged from .50 to .99. Two examples of sets of photographs are presented in Figures 1 and 2.

Insert Figure 1 and 2 about here

Previous Research

Milgram (1976) refers to the camera as the "image freezing machine." Combs & Ziller (1977) emphasize the information reduction process associated with taking a photograph. Thus, photography may be described as a cognitive process with images as products.

Human information processing produces thousands of images in short periods of time. It is this deluge of images which may have curtailed initial attempts to use photography in the social sciences (see Worth & Adair, 1972). Worth and Adair asked Navajo Indiana to shoot and edit movies about subjects of their own choosing. The approach described here

incorporates the phenomenological approach created by Worth and Adair but emphasizes the self-concept and the more intense information reduction demanded by still photography. The study described here was designed to demonstrate the utility of the approach to the study of orientations and a set of orientations (the psychological niche).

Two earlier classic studies of poverty used images as the basic data. The first of these was one of the great books of American journalism, "How the Other Half Lives", by Jacob A. Riis, published in 1890. Photographs of New York's Hell's Kitchen and similar areas were taken by the journalist himself. It was the journalist's view of poverty rather than the view of the person experiencing poverty.

In 1964 Robert Coles described the poverty experience as a close observer, but also in the role of a professional, a physician. In attempting to communicate with chidren, he found that it was advantageous for the children to use crayons and paper to communicate.

"Young children, however, are often uninterested in conversation. They want to be on the move, and they are often bored at the prospect of hearing words and being expected to use them.....as one eight-year-old boy once told me -- "Talking is okay, but I don't like to do it all the time the way grown-ups do; I guess you have to develop the habit p. 41)."

Still drawing requires some degree of skill, whereas photography as an image production apparatus is astonishingly simple, particularly in terms of the product, the picture.

Results

The results are reported in Table 1. The five findings which differentiate the children of affluence from the children of poverty pertain to the self, activities, books, games, and range of orientations.

It was observed that 13.06% of the photographs of the affluent children and 4.5% of the photographs of children of the poor included a photograph of the self ($F = 4.34$, $p < .05$). Most strikingly, however, about 23% of the photographs of affluent boys include the self whereas none of the photographs of poor girls included a photograph of the self.

The results with regard to activities showed differences between the affluent and poor children very similar to those involving the self; 24.12% of the photographs of the affluent children and 4.42% of the photographs taken by children of the poor depicted activity ($F = 13.36$, $p < .001$). Again the greatest difference was between affluent boys and poor girls. Furthermore, 36.25% of the photographs by affluent boys depicted activity, whereas not one of the photographs taken by poor girls showed activity.

A subcategory of activity, music and art activities, shows a significant difference between boys and girls ($p < .02$), but the difference is largely due to affluent boys. Almost 19% of their photographs show this orientation as opposed to about 4% for children of poverty.

The results with regard to orientation toward books are almost entirely accounted for by poor boys. Somewhat surprisingly, poor boys showed a higher percent of photographs involving books (10% vs 2%, or less for all other cells ($F = 4.19$, $p < .02$). Perhaps because school experience for these children was rare, it was of special significance for the self difinition.

The results with regard to games and toys followed a pattern similar to that concerning "activity". Not one of the poor girls showed a photograph of toys or games, where 10.50% of the affluent boys' photographs

showed photographs of games and 18% showed toys.

Children of affluence also showed a greater range of orientation ($p < .006$).

Insert Table 1 about here

Finally, it must be noted that religious orientation was indicated by children of poverty but not by children of affluence. The results were not statistically significant, however.

Perhaps the simplest indicator for differentiating photography by the poor and by the rich was green grass. None of the photographs taken by the poor showed green grass.

Girls versus Boys

The most significant differences between girls and boys involve the categories of school ($p < .02$), hedonic tone ($p < .02$), activity ($p < .008$), possessions ($p < .006$), religion ($p < .04$), toys ($p < .005$), crowds ($p < .005$), holding child ($p < .059$) and father ($p < .068$). Girls showed less smiling, activity, music and art activities ($p < .08$) possessions, toys, father; but more school, religion, crowds, and holding a child.

Poverty Girls versus Affluent Boys

As already indicated, some of the most extreme differences were observed between affluent boys and poverty girls. The girls of poverty showed no photographs of self, activities, games or toys, whereas every affluent boy showed at least one photograph which included the self, the most photographs involving music and art activities, lessons, possessions, games and toys, and the least photographs showing others, groups, and religion. In addition, girls of poverty showed the least possessions,

and lowest range of orientations but most of crowds (more than 3 people), holding a child, most of other people, and most of groups.

Discussion

The results with regard to children of poverty compared with children of affluence are repeated but are more pronounced when comparing girls of poverty with boys of affluence. Perhaps boys best represent the effects of affluence and girls best represent effects of poverty. Essentially, affluence - poverty and boy - girl represent two status variables and by comparing affluent boys and poverty girls the extremes of dual status are described and the effects of high and low status are magnified.

The matrix of orientations (the psychological niche) of the affluent boys is broad or less limiting and involves the self, activities, games, lessons, and possessions. The psychological niche of the girls of poverty is narrow and more limiting and does not involve the self. Instead, the psychological niche for girls of poverty showed groups of more than 3 persons, people, groups and holding a child. The psychological niche of the affluent boys suggests a broad self-orientation, whereas the psychological niche of the affluent girls suggests a narrow other-orientation. Both may be assumed to be functional.

The self-orientation of affluent boys is assumed to be functional in preparation for a competitive society for status maintenance. The exclusiveness or exclusion indicated by the environment of the affluent boys has been noted by other observers (Coles, 1964). "One must be aloof", p. 492). "Built into the childhood of these boys and girls is isolation..... the distance that a 'private way' in a city provides.....(p. 527)". "I am not like a lot of other kids, I know it. We live away from other

people and we don't see too many people. My parents like their privacy (p. 527)."

The relative isolation and self-orientation requires some other set of elements in order to establish a self-sustaining system. This set of elements appears to be activities, lessons, games and toys. This extended set of elements resolves the problem of relative isolation and provides opportunities for frequent self-enhancement, or self reinforcement. The relative isolation, the set of readily available activities and the self-orientation provide a closed but sustaining psychological niche for children of affluence.

With regard to children of poverty as reflected in the photographs taken by the poor girls, there appears to be almost a self-effacement (no photograph of the self) and a emphasis on the social environment (people, more than 3 people in the photographs, holding children) and an apparent lack of activities, at least as the affluent children know activities. The psychological niche of children of poverty is in a large part a social-psychological niche, a social support system required for survival. Isolation renders the individual singularly vulnerable under the tenuous conditions of poverty.

Symbiotic with the emphasis on social orientation is a de-emphasis of the self per se as well as a de-emphasis on activities which may lead to self-enhancement. For the most part, girls of poverty assume the role of "mother" very early in their life because the mother is working, if at all possible. The extended group is the support system and it is the role of the female to maintain it. Because of the limitations of the photographic approach, the "activities" of the girls of poverty are not revealed to us, but they would show carrying water back to their room,

and other related family-maintenance activities rather than self-enhancing activities.

The study has several other limitations which must be considered. The Polaroid cameras did not include a flash attachment which placed some limits on indoor photography, even though it was done. More importantly, the number of subjects is small. It would be helpful to repeat the study in a second city or county using cameras with flash attachments.

Nevertheless, the current study demonstrates the utility of the orientation framework, which combined with the method of auto-photography leads to a depiction of the psychological niche. The psychological niche takes into account the person-environment interaction and the resulting cognitive outcomes through imagery. The auto-photographic approach to the study of the psychological niche compells consideration of the environment in understanding persons. Only people, objects, scenes and symbols can be photographed, and these are found in the person's environment. Moreover, the environment limits behavioral alternatives which in turn redounds to the self-concept. Thus it is proposed that the data collection approach, auto-photography, compells ecological validity to personality research. Information is not independent of the source (Johnson, 1980). Visual communication as a source affords information in an environmental context.

References

Billou, Richard M.
1977 Metaphor: A Review of Psychological Literature. Psychological Bulletin 84 (1): 81-92.

Bugental, James F. T. and Seymour, L. Z.
1950 Investigations into the Self-Concept. Journal of Personality 18 (4) 413-498.

Coles, Robert
1964 Children of Crisis Boston: Little, Brown, Co.

Combs, Jeanne M., and Ziller, Robert C.
1977 The Photographic Self-Concept of Counselers. Journal of Counseling Psychology 24 (6): 452-455.

Gentner, Dedre
1977 On the Development of Metaphor Processing. Child Development 48 (2): 1034-1039.

Hall, Calvin S., and Van De Castle, Robert V.
1966 The Content Analysis of Dreams. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, D. M.
1980 What Makes Some Information Visual? Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour 10 (3): 231-241.

Kelly, George A.
1955 The Psychology of Personal Constructs. New York: Norton

Kuhn, Munford H., and McPartland, Thomas S.
1954 An Empirical Investigation of Self Attitudes American Sociological Review 19 (1): 68:76.

Levy, Leon H.
1963 Psychological Interpretation. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Milgram, Stanley
1976 The Image Freezing Machine. Social Sciences and Modern Society 14 (1): 7-12.

Ortony, Andrew and Reynold, Ralph E.
1978 Metaphor: Theoretical and Empirical Research Psychological Bulletin 85 (5) 919-943.

Parsons, Talcott, and Shils, Edward A.
1962 Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge, Massachusetts Harvard University Press.

Petrie, Hugh
1979 Metaphor and Learning. In Metaphor and thought. Andrew Ortony ed. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Polanyi, MIchael
1966 The Tacit Dimension
New York: Doubleday

Winget, Carolyn, and Kramer, Milton Dimensions of Dreams
1979 Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida

Worth, Sol and Adair, John
1972 Through Navajo Eyes. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Ziller, Robert C. and Smith, Dale E.
1977 A Phenomenological Utilization of Photographs. Journal of Phenomenological Psychology 7 (2): 172-185.

Ziller, Robert C. and Lewis, Douglas
1981 Orientation: Self, Social Environmental Percepts through Auto-Photography. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin (in press).

Footnotes

[1]The authors wish to thank Polaroid Corporation for providing the cameras and film for this study.

Figure 1

The Photographic Self-Concept

of a

13 Year-old Affluent Boy

from

Mexico City

Figure 2

The Photographic Self-Concept

of a

13 Year-old Boy of Poverty

from

Mexico City

Figure 3

The Photographic Self-Concept

of a

13 Year-old Affluent Girl

from

Mexico City

Figure 4

The Photographic Self-Concept

of a

13 Year-old Girl of Poverty

from

Mexico City

Mean Percent of Photographs Taken by
Affluent or Poverty Children Representing 18 Orientations

Economic	Sex	N	(Self)	(Social)	(Group)	(Groups 3+)
Affluent	Boy	8	22.75	21.63	11.25	3.25
Affluent	Girl	9	15.56	29.00	17.78	17.89
Poverty	Boy	6	9.17	28.83	14.67	3.33
Poverty	Girl	6	0.00	35.00	18.33	25.33
			Economic (p<.05)			Sex (p<.005)

			(Father)	(Mother)	(Holding Child)	(Home)
Affluent	Boy	8	1.25	3.00	0.00	7.50
Affluent	Girl	9	0.00	3.33	1.11	7.77
Poverty	Boy	6	5.83	5.83	0.00	5.00
Poverty	Girl	6	0.00	3.67	3.33	1.67
			Sex (p<.07)			

			(School)	(Books)	(Aesthetic)	(Hedonic Tone)
Affluent	Boy	8	0.00	1.25	19.75	19.00
Affluent	Girl	9	3.33	2.22	18.00	2.33
Poverty	Boy	6	0.00	10.50	25.50	33.00
Poverty	Girl	6	3.33	1.67	11.67	10.00
			Sex (p<.02)	Economic (p<.04) Sex (p<.02) Ec & Sex (p<.02)		Sex (p<.02)

			(Activities)	(Music-Art)	(Possessions)	Religion)
Affluent	Boy	8	36.25	18.63	33.63	0.00
Affluent	Girl	9	13.33	0.00	5.56	5.56
Poverty	Boy	6	8.83	6.67	22.17	0.00
Poverty	Girl	6	0.00	1.67	5.00	1.67
			Economic (p<.001) Sex (p<.008)	Sex (p<.02)	Sex (p<.006)	Sex (p<.04)

			(Games)	(Toys)	(Orientation Range)
Affluent	Boy	8	10.50	18.00	.10
Affluent	Girl	9	8.89	2.22	.12
Poverty	Boy	6	1.67	7.17	.05
Poverty	Girl	6	0.00	0.00	.06
			Economic (p<.01)	Economic (p<.09) Sex (p<.004)	Economic (p<.006)

Mean Number of Photographs Per Set

Grade	Sex	N	Aesthetic	Alcohol	Cars
Freshmen	M	20	0.25	0.65	1.05
Freshmen	F	20	0.90	0.60	0.30
Senior	M	20	0.80	0.40	0.55
Senior	F	20	0.65	0.25	0.15

			Children	Fraternity/Sorority	Groups
Freshmen	M	20	0.00	0.15	0.75
Freshmen	F	20	0.00	0.35	0.65
Senior	M	20	0.10	0.00	0.15
Senior	F	20	0.25	0.05	0.40

			Hedonic Tone	Money	Private Residence
Freshmen	M	20	1.05	0.10	0.05
Freshmen	F	20	0.65	0.05	0.15
Senior	M	20	0.55	0.00	0.20
Senior	F	20	0.75	0.05	0.35

			Recreation	Religion	School
Freshmen	M	20	0.35	0.05	0.15
Freshmen	F	20	0.20	0.20	0.10
Senior	M	20	0.25	0.00	0.10
Senior	F	20	0.40	0.00	0.05

			Single Persons/Male-Female Dyad
Freshmen	M	20	0.15
Freshmen	F	20	0.40
Senior	M	20	0.65
Senior	F	20	0.75